UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/592,932 | 09/04/2008 | Ingo Udo Borchers | 056226.58024US | 5766 |
| 23911 CROWELL & I | 7590 08/17/200 MORING LLP | EXAMINER | | |
| INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP P.O. BOX 14300 WASHINGTON, DC 20044-4300 | | | LUKS, JEREMY AUSTIN | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2832 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 08/17/2009 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|--|--|--|--|
| Office Action Comments | 10/592,932 | BORCHERS ET AL. | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | JEREMY LUKS | 2832 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 Se | eptember 2006. | | | | | |
| | action is non-final. | | | | | |
| <i>,</i> — | ' | | | | | |
| • | closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | |
| | pa | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>4-7</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>4-7</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | |
| | oloction requirement | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| 10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>15 September 2006</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | | |
| | | ` ' | | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | |
| 12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of: | | | | | | |
| 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents | s have been received | | | | | |
| | | on No | | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents | • • | | | | | |
| | 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage | | | | | |
| application from the International Bureau | application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | | | | | |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) | | | | | | |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date Notice of Informal Patent Application | | | | | | |
| B) ☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/15/06. 6) ☐ Other: | | | | | | |
| 1 apor 110(0)/main bate <u>0/10/00</u> . | | | | | | |

Art Unit: 2832

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 1. Claims 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoch (4,150,732) in view of Borchers (5,760,349).

With respect to Claim 4, Hoch teaches an acoustically absorbent lining for a hot gas flow channel of an arrangement for abatement of noise generated by a turbofan drive (Col. 1, Lines 7-19) comprising: four sound guides (Figure 1, #5a) extending into each of a plurality of adjacent cavities (4a) (Col. 4, Lines 9-13 – note that the amount of resonant cavities is variable, thus teaching a plurality of cavities). Hoch fails to teach wherein the sound guides are horn shaped, and a perforated cover plate to which each of the horns is attached at a mouth thereof, wherein the cover plate forms a wall of the hot gas flow channel. Borchers teaches a resonant cavity having a horn shaped sound guide (Figure 3, #2), and a perforated cover plate (3) to which each of the horns (when used in combaintion) is attached at a mouth thereof (Col. 4, Lines 32-36), wherein the cover plate (3) forms a wall of the hot gas flow channel when used in combination. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the apparatus of Hoch, with the apparatus of Borchers to improve energy dissipation of the flow through the sound collector by shaping the sound collector as a

Application/Control Number: 10/592,932

Art Unit: 2832

horn as opposed to a tube, creating an improved broadband absorber. Further, the permeable cover of Borchers will improve absorption of the resonator cavity.

Page 3

With respect to Claim 5, It would have been an obvious design choice to provide wherein the cavities, measured in directions of the horns, are 34 mm deep, wherein the horns are 23 mm long, wherein a diameter of the mouth is 23 mm, and wherein a diameter of a throat of the horn is 7 mm, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. In re Rose, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955). Further, Borchers teaches that changing the geometric parameters can tune the absorber to a desired frequency range,

With respect to Claims 6 and 7, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide wherein the cover plate has a porosity which amounts to at least 20%, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or working range involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233. Further, it has been held that discovering the optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the Art. In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). It is noted that Brochers discusses experimenting with the porosity of the cover plate to optimize absorption (Col. 4, Lines 36-43).

Conclusion

2. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Pertinent arts of record are disclosed in the PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeremy Luks whose telephone number is (571) 272-2707. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8:30-6:00, and alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Elvin Enad can be reached on (571) 272-1990. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jeremy Luks/ Examiner, Art Unit 2837 Application/Control Number: 10/592,932 Page 5

Art Unit: 2832

/Jeffrey Donels/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2832